

Applicant Name: Tom Connors Ph.D.

Proceeding Name: 98-67 Author Name: |

Lawfirm Name:

Contact Name: applicant_name

Contact Email: connors.tom@snet.net

Address Line 1: 340 Twin Lakkas Road

Address Line 2:

City: North Branford

State: CT

Zip Code: 06471 Postal Code:

Submission Type: CO

Submission Status: ACCEPTED

Viewing Status: UNRESTRICTED

Subject:

DA Number:

Exparte Late Filed: [] File Number: []

Calendar Date Filed: 06/20/1998 3:05:57 PM

Date Disseminated:

Official Date Filed: 06/22/1998

Filed From: INTERNET

Confirmation # 11998620758293

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

INTERNET FILING

98-67
06/22/98

No. of Copies rec'd /
List A B C D E

I am a person with a disability due to a spinal cord injury. My concern is loss of my ability to communicate with blind and deaf colleagues and friends. Please adopt the Access Board's guidelines. As we know today's exotic gadget becomes tomorrow's household commonplace.

The suggestion that companies should be able to recoup monies expended to make their products and services accessible is untenable. Cost recovery as a criterion for "readily achievable" denies indirect product benefits, which accrue as an expanded audience integrates other products into the one, they produce. This unforeseen benefit is difficult to assess. Nevertheless if no cost benefit were derived the societal benefit in productivity of people with disabilities is immeasurable.

Finally, an appeal process that includes fees may screen out frivolous complaints but it creates impediments to reasonable oversight. The incidence of incomes at or below poverty level among people with disabilities is much higher than the general population. Given this demographic, filing fees, rather than a screening device, becomes a huge barrier to due process.